

REMARKS

This Amendment is being submitted in response to the Official Action mailed in this application on June 22, 2006. A Request for an Extension of Time accompanies this Amendment. By this Amendment, claims 7-16 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 17-24. Original claims 1-6 were written in the European “use” style format. A Preliminary Amendment was submitted to present the claims in a format standard in the United States. However, the present Amendment better reflects the invention for the United States as method claims. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and further in view of the following remarks.

First, Applicants appreciate the acknowledgement that the Preliminary Amendment and the Information Disclosure Statements filed in this application have been received and considered.

With respect to the specification, Applicants note that the “guidelines illustrate the *preferred* layout” (emphasis added). Since no particular arrangement is *required*, Applicants have not amended the specification.

Claims 7-16 were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103. However, only one rejection included the rejection of claims 12 and 16. The content of claims 12 and 16, that the dressing, when placed in water, gives a release of ionic silver into water of less than 1 ppm, has been added to all the new claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit that all the rejections but the rejection of claims 12 and 16 have been obviated.

With respect to the rejection of claims 12 and 16, claims 12 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any of WO 01/024839, WO 02/43743, WO 02/078755, an article by Nathan, et al., EP 361722, WO 00/09173, US 6592888, US 6267782 or US 6333093. Applicants traverse this rejection.

According to the rejection, “it is expected that the matrix disclosed by any of the references ... will release the same amount of silver into the wound”. Of course, there is no basis for this statement. Moreover, Example 4 of the application shows that Acticoat Burn released 35.1 ppm of silver after 5 hours compared to 0.8 ppm for a dressing according to the invention.

Since the basis for the rejection is without merit, Applicants request that it be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of the application with claims 17-24, are all respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Bristol-Myers Squibb Company
Patent Department
100 Headquarters Park Drive
Skillman, NJ 08558

Date: October 20, 2006

/JMK/
John M. Kilcoyne
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 33,100
(908) 904-2372